F8094

THE CANADIAN NAVY

SPEECH DELIVERED BY

LT.-COL. MACDONALD, M.P.

Of Pictou, N.S., December 1st, 1910.

FS012
910
M135

The EDITH *and* LORNE PIERCE
COLLECTION *of* CANADIANA

Queen's University at Kingston

SPEECH DELIVERED BY

LT.-COL. MACDONALD, M.P.

Of Pictou, N.S., December 1st, 1910

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, this afternoon the House had the opportunity of listening to a most unique deliverance. An hon. geneleman with a long parliamentary experience, was endeavouring—if I may indulge in language somewhat similar to that which he so frequently uses —to perform in an artistic way the feat of swallowing himself. And I am sure that hon. members on both sides of the House felt that he found the task more difficult than on any previous occasion—though it is a feat which the hon. member has performed more than once in his previous career. He very fittingly gave the key to the situation of his party in the closing words of his peroration. 'We are in trouble,' said he. 'We are in confusion, we cannot hold up our heads.' With the unerring accuracy of long experience, he rightly diagnosed the condition of his party. I do not know whether he had heard of the meeting of the Borden Club last night in Toronto, the club which bears the name of his leader. At that club an address of the most significant character was delivered, one which it is just as well to read to the House particularly because it is exeremely apt in view of the peroration of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster). This address was given by Mr. W. D. Earngey to the Borden Club.

"I don't believe in Nationalism,' said Mr. W. D. Earngey at the annual meeting of the Borden Club last night. 'I am a Tory, but had I been down in Drummond and Arthabaska I'd have voted for the Laurier candidate. Nationalism should be nipped in the bud. I feel sore that the Whip and other prominent men of the Tory party—"

—including my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster).

"—sent a telegram of congratulation to Mr. Gilbert on his election, but they had not the nerve or the grit to applaud him on his introduction into the House. I think that is weak Toryism, weak Nationalism, weak Canadianism. And I think the Conservative party has weakened itself by making professions of loyalty."

My hon. friend's keen judgment as a political physician—for his long experience in politics entitles him to be ranked as a doctor—as to the condition of his party, that it is in trouble and confusion and unable to hold up its head, is verified, not merely by the situation of the moment but by the situation of the party at all times during the past year. What was the situation of the Conservative party when the House adjourned some six months ago? It was blazoned forth all over the country that, immediately after the session, a convention would be called to formulate a policy for the party. Hon. gentlemen opposite had got tired of using their old shibboleths. There were people teaching one theory in one part of the country and others denying it in another part of the country. The ocasion demanded that there should be a getting together of the members of the Conservative party in order that they might find out where they stood. But they never met and the lack of policy, which was conceded, the lack of unity, which everybody witnessed, at the conclusion of the last session of parliament, exists to-day in accentuated form. Then, the leader proposed to inaugurate a tour in the province of Ontario. But the farmers were busy with the crops and could not go out to hear him. So the meetings were broken off and we were told that they were to be resumed in the fall. Then those in control came to the conclusion that the farmers were more interested in fall fairs than in Conservative poltics. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) was not included in that tour. A new lieutenant was selected to accompany him. The hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) was to be the new Moses who was to lead the Conservative party out of the trouble, the confusion, the condition in which they were unable to hold up their heads. And the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) sat down under his apple trees at Apohaqui—

Mr. FOSTER. They were plum trees.

Mr. MACDONALD. Let us say that there was a diversity of fruit and that the greatest peach sat under the apple tree. From his Cave of Adullam he watched the curious peregrinations of his friends throughout the country, and saw the absolute failure on the part of the people to pay the slightest attention to their arguments and proposals. He waited the time when the House would open and once more he would be seated as his leader's deskmate and be ready to inaugurate the Conservative policy. In the

meantime, all those who were interested in athletics, and more particularly in pugilism, were wondering as to the fate of a gentleman by the name of Jeffries and whether he could 'come back' or not. And since then the public have been wondering whther my hon. friend from North Toronto was going to 'come back' or not. We have had the first round of the duel to-day. The hon. gentleman's lungs seem to be in good order, and his arms work as vigorously as usual; but there seems to be no force to his blows. Every hon. member of this House, whether he sits behind my hon. friend, or whether he sits on this side, rendered the verdict, when the House rose at six o'clock, that if Jeffries-Foster is coming back he has got the worst of the first round.

My hon. friend realizes keenly the fact that there is trouble and confusion and that he cannot hold up his head. And why? Because he finds that, whereas he once preached in favour of a sturdy navy, and in favour of a compact which was acceded to by men of all political faiths two years ago, under which Canada agreed to come forward, and, by a united people and with a determined policy, do her duty to the empire, now in some way, whether through the influence of the new lieutenant or not, there has been an understanding arrived at with the anti-imperialists of the province of Quebec. And so it is that, though talking as he did this afternoon and declaring that he stood by every word of what he said in 1909, he knows in his heart that when he votes, as he intends to do, he will vote against everything he then declared for. He said that, had Canada done as Australia did, we should never have had this question before this parliament. I shall deal with the accuracy of this statement as to the position of Australia later on. But he knows that were it not for the fact that an election took place in Drummond and Arthabaska, and that his leader is weak enough to fancy that there will be some comfort for the Conservative party in the result there, we should never have had this amendment for which hon. gentlemen are to be asked to vote. What is the evidence of that understanding, which is quite as patent to the member for North Toronto as it is to any other member in this House? Immediately behind his leader sits the first lieutenant, from the province of Quebec, of the Conservative party, and although he preached a policy of anti-imperialism a month ago, although he told the people of his province—and he admits it—that conscription was to be the policy of the Laurier government.

Mr. MONK. I beg my hon. friend's pardon, I never made that admission.

Mr. MACDONALD. I can turn up the 'Hansard'; if not, some of my friends will, where my hon. friend said to the people of Drummond-Arahtbaska that conscription was the natural corolary of the Navy Bill. My hon. friend won't deny that, he admits it. I need not read it, because it is conceded.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend has just stated in the last instance what I did say, that conscription must necessarily follow.

Mr. MACDONALD. Then my hon. friend, in seeking to make these fine distinctions, is simply folowing up this alleged policy of his. He advocates a policy so vague that nobody can understand what it means unless it means anti-imperialism and anti-Canadianism. My hon. friend may make these narrow distinctions, but a man who goes into a constituency and tells the people that the effect of the navy legislation of this government means that conscription must follow, is certainly stating what is untrue.

Mr. MONK. It has followed in Australia.

Mr. MACDONALD. Well, of course my hon. friend from North Toronto does not want conscription, he does not believe it is necessary; therefore, we have this strange condition of affairs, these two lieutenants of the leader of the opposition sitting in juxtaposition, one behind him and the other alongside of him, one preaching imperialism in Ontario in order to make this know-nothing do-nothing policy of the leader of the Conservative party palatable in the English provinces, and the other stating what is inaccurate in regard to conscription in order to catch votes in the province of Quebec. My hon. friend who sits behind the leader of the opposition, had he a seat in the English parliament, holding the views which he does hold, in antagonism to his party, would not if he was out of touch with them be found retaining the seat which he holds by virtue of the fact that he is lieutenant of the leader of the opposition; he would proceed to the cross benches, he would ask you to find a seat where his position would indicate that he was not acting in accordance with either political party. But my hon. friend still sits there, and the work goes on.

Now let us see what the attitude of our friends of the National party is. The National party of Canada, or the anti-imperialistic party I prefer to call them—because as a matter of fact those of us who are proud of our country, who realize that even to-day, after 43 years of our national life, it is a humiliating thing that we should be found here engaged in a discussion of questions of sectionalism and of race—I say those of us Canadians who are proud of the fact that Canada is a nation within the British Empire, claim the right and title of nationalists from the fact of being Canadians. But those gentlemen are not nationalists, they are anti-imperialists, and their anti-imperialism began in 1900

when, under the leadership of Mr. Bourassa, they adopted the attitude that Canada should not assist in any foreign wars, no matter in what dire necessity the empire might be. Then they followed up that policy in regard to the autonomy Bills for the new northwest provinces, when the leader of the House was characterized by gentlemen who opposed that policy as having forfeited everything which his race and his creed in the province of Quebec had a right to claim from him in regard to that legislation. In addition to that, they advocated a narrow immigration policy, a policy which, if it was followed out, would leave our great northwest with a very sparse populaiton indeed, and would close this Canada of ours, to all people from foreign lands who might wish to come here and unite with us in building up a great nation. If these anti-imperialists views prevailed, no people from foreign lands would come here to find a home. Following out this line of opposition to any participation in the wars of the empire, my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, after waiting for the compact, rushed into a coalition with Mr. Bourassa and assumed his present attitude on the naval question. How dose my hon. friend from North Toronto, with his imperialist tendency, with all the declarations which he summoned to his aid this afternoon in behalf of the extreme position he has taken up,, how can he sit calm and tight, and send telegrams of congratulation to those anti-imperialists to this faction, which oppose the upbuilding of a Canadian nationality ?

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to correct my hon. friend who, I am sure, does not want to misrepresent me. I sent no telegram of congratulation.

Mr. MACDONALD. Well, I suppose my hon. friend takes the position that he would not send a telegram of congratulation.

Mr. FOSTER. I am simply correcting a very gross mistake of my hon. friend, and I wish my statement to be accepted.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend is quite right, I should have referred to the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), who sent a telegram to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The member for Toronto said there is good stuff in Bourassa.

Mr. MACDONALD. Yes, because he is an anti-imperialist, there is good stuff in him. He would not tell the House whether he regrets that he did not send a telegram of congratulation or not; but since he has seen this deliverance of the Borden Club in Toronto, I suppose we would hesitate about it.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not in a telling humour.

Mr. MACDONALD. I would like to know if there is anybody in this House who can diagnose what kind of humour the hon. member for Toronto is in. Now, let us see where our friends the anti-imperialists stand upon this question. Do they say they want no navy in this country, or do they not ? I have heard their policy variously interpreted. My hon. friend from Beauce (Mr. Beland) says that the anti-imperialists want a Canadian navy, a navy that will have nothing to do with the empire, no matter in what stress or storm she may one day find herself. I do not know whether that is their position, or whether their position is that they want no navy at all. I am aware that Mr. Lavergne goes to Toronto and says that he is willing to support a navy. But who can tell the vagaries of these gentlemen who claim to be anti-imperialists when they are running an election in certain districts in the province of Quebec ? They do not know themselves.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend should be able to speak authoritatively about vagaries.

Mr. MACDONALD. Well, my hon. friend has addressed this House once or twice in regard to this policy, and if anybody else but himself can tell where he stands on this question, I would like to know it. He is sitting cheek by jowl with this imperialist for North Toronto. His appeals to prejudice, his threats of conscription, are absolutely without foundation, although they seem to be his chief stock in trade in discussing the naval question. The fact is, these gentlemen who are aligning themselves with the member for North Toronto are trying to build up a party in the province of Quebec, not inspired by Canadian aims, but resting upon a narrow race and religious basis, with the view of wringing from one or other of the great political parties in this country things which are unfair, which are anti-Canadian, and which would not tend to the upbuilding of a strong Canadian nation. Sir, it is in conjunction with these people that my hon. friends of the opposition are acting to-day. We see the effect of that conjunction in the attitude to-day of the leader of the opposition on the navy, who advocates that nothing should be done. Had there been no amendment by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, there would have been no amendment by the leader of the opposition. The leader of the opposition had discussed the address, he had closed his remarks with reference to the navy, but when the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) came along and moved his amendment, then, in order to, if possible, take in all those various elements who are opposed to the navy, whether imperialists or anti-imperialists, we find this amendment and the evidence which exists beyond all doubt as to the association of the opposition with these anti-imperialists in this House. Who is it that rushes to the defence of the hon. gentleman like the member for Champlain (Mr. Blondin),

when he indulges in breaches of order ? Who, but his leader, the leader of the opposition in this House, who apparently fancies that possibly by dividing his forces some time in the future he may be a conqueror. It is as well for this House and this country to understand the unholy coalition that exists to-day amongst these warring elements of the Conservative party. What is the evidence of this ? Instead of having an imperialistic navy, such a navy as that proposed by the hon. the leader of the opposition on every hustings, a navy working at all times under the direct control of the imperial authorities, my hon. friend has got down to the position to-day that he does not want a navy at all. Some time in the long and dim and distant future when the ideal of imperial federation is realized forsooth, will we have a navy then ? No. He will talk about it and he will go to parliament about it and then he will go to the people about it. That is not where my hon. friend was in 1909. He filled page after page of 'Hansard' talking of the weary Titan and the burden he had borne all the years. To-night he says we will have no navy at all, and will give no assistance to Great Britain until imperial federation is brought about. Of course this evidence of an understanding is so apparent that my hon. friend's friends in the country got on to it, as witness the statement in the Borden Club last night in Toronto, and then in that good Conservative paper, the Toronto 'News,' day before yesterday,, under the heading 'Steady.' Here is a correspondent who says :

"All my life I have found public men go too far to catch a temporary wave of opinion."

That is what my hon. friends are doing.

"I have become so certain that this will always be done that I have begun to think is more clear than that in the whole history is more clear tha nthat is the whole history of our politics playing to Quebec never served the interests of an opposition."

And that is what these gentlemen are doing, playing to the reactionary, anti-imperialist element of Quebec, preaching imperialism everywhere else, trying to delude themselves into the belief that by offering resolutions in the House and talking differently outside, they may hold their support in this country.

What further is the evidence that my hon. friends have deserted all the traditions of their party ? Who first proposed the participation of Canada in naval defence ? Away back in 1866, Sir John A. Macdonald at the time of the meeting of the representatives of the different provinces to lay down the terms of confederation, moved the resolution which is incorporated in the British North America Act to-day under which power was given to this parliament to provide for a militia and naval service in this country. That was followed by Sir George Etienne Cartier,, who in 1868, by the Militia Act provided for the permanent militia in Canada. So we come along the intervening years with suggestions here and there, mainly from hon. gentlemen opposite and their leaders, as to the duty which Canada owed in this respect and the necessity of acting in her own interest. Until, in 1909, my hon. friend who spoke this evening brought forward this resolution, to which assent was given by many gentlemen who have taken a curious position since. My hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) for instance said in 1909 :

"The question is asked: Is the resolutions before us specific enough ? Does it go far enough ? I am not going to discuss that question further than to say that personally I think the time has arrived for Canada to take a decided stand. It will not do for us simply to put resolutions at conferences; it will not do for us simply to say by resolution that we are willing to do so and so. That resolution has been practically before the country since 1902 or 1903 and nothing has been done in reference to the navy. It is true that something has been done in reference to taking over the two fortifications of Halifax and Esquimalt, but absolutely nothing has been done in reference to a contribution to the assistance of the navy as far as the Dominion of Canada is concerned. It is not enough to say to-day that we will stand absolutely in the position we took in 1902 at the Colonial conference; it is our duty to assert that while that is our principle yet the time has come to show the mother land that we are prepared to back up our sympathy by some actual effort."

My hon. friend will vote to-night in favour of a resolution that Canada shall do nothing until we have imperial federation.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The reason I am proposing to do nothing to-night is because the right hon. the leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has not carried out the unanimous resolution of 1909.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend after all his eloquent address of two years ago admits that to-night he has come to the conclusion that nothing should be done at all.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The hon. gentleman has not fairly interpreted what I said. My statement was that because the premier had not carried out the resolution which we passed unanimously in this House, the matter comes back to this House and is once more at issue and I am going to have the issue go before the people.

Mr. MACDONALD. Yes, my hon. friend is an illustration of the hon. gentlemen who think that by voting for a resolution which means nothing, they can get away

from the policy which was announced, by and which is the policy of his leader, and if he follows it—and I do not know exactly whom my hon. friends on the other side are following now—but if the policy of the hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) is followed, there will be nothing done about a navy until imperial federation is attained. Then there is my genial friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie). My hon. friend talked about tin-pot navies. He said :

"Now carrying out the idea first involved in naval defence for Canada, I do not see any reasons why we should not immediately institute some system of naval defence along the lines of torpedo boats, or torpedo destroyers, and destroyer cruisers, which would be invaluable to us in case of war A great many members suggest or imply that it would be impossible for us to build these at home——"

And I quite agree with the hon. member for North Simcoe in the argument that he made here that when we build ships whether big or small, for a navy in Canada, we should build them in Canada, yet the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) tonight found fault with the government because they were going to build these ships in Canada. He said this resolution of 1909 did not mean that the ships were to be built in Canada. The hon. member for North Simcoe went further. He said :

"As I pointed out we should immediately assume the position of establishing a local defence of our own. Our local defence should consist of torpedo boats and destroyers, and they could convoy our merchant ships, in case of war, to England and save them from the attacks of cruisers."

Then said my hon. friend, and I assume he was speaking for the hon. gentlemen who sit with him :

"I think we are all presumed to be at one on that question."

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). The hon. gentleman will not find a single line of my remarks opposed by submitting this question to the people.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend, like a good many others of the gentlemen who sit around him, would like to escape by that back door. But my hon. friend (Mr. Currie) talked for an hour and he did not say one word about submitting the question to the people.

Mr. CURRIE. I do not wis hto obstruct the beautiful flow of oratory of the hon. member for Pictou, but what I say is that the question of a general policy is altogether different from going into this matter in a small way. I did not expect that the expenditure would be so great as $7,000,000 or $8,000,000 a year, but I presume that a member of this House is always entitled to carry out to its logical conclusion any position he takes on any question.

Mr. MACDONALD. I could mention a good many hon. gentlemen on that side of the House who would like to make explanatory speeches just as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Currie) has done, but I want to remind my hon. friend that when he made that speech in 1909, he was fresh from this electorate. Every man who sat in this parliament then, every man who voted for that navy resolution in the winter of 1909 had received his mandate from the people in the November previous. It was not a question that was discussed in a stale House; it was discussed by members just back from their constituents. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) after much difficulty had been re-elected and no doubt he moved the resolution prompted by the spirit which he thought animated his people, and he wanted immediate action. So did my hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) so did my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie), and if these gentlemen went to the people the day after to-morrow they could not be any better advised as to what the people want than when they spoke in this House in the winter of 1909. My hon. friend (Mr. Currie) says he said nothing against going to the people in 1909. That is the worst kind of quibbling because the hon. gentleman knew that in 1909 he was speaking for his constituents, and if he was not speaking for them he had no right to sit in this House. And these gentlemen opposite who talk about tin-pot navies and who speak so contemptuously about these small vessels; these naval authorities who know so much more than Lord Beresford and Sir William White and all these experts whose judgment has guided the policy of this government as to the character of the ships purchased; they talk about tin-pot navies. The hon. gentleman from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) knows better than a good many of them, and the only regret I have for him is that he has not the manliness to vote in accordance with the real opinion which he undoubtedly holds. We have heard a great deal of rhodomontade from these gentlemen about trusting the people and submitting the question to the people, but let me remind them that when the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) moved the resolution for which every one of them including the hon. gentleman for Jacques Cartier voted, they had just received a mandate from the people not more than two months before they came here to the opening of that parliament. And, if they did not know what their people wanted then I would like to know how you are ever going to find out what the people want under the constitutional practice in this country. In 1909 my hon. friend from North Toronto was the most emphatic of them all. I know not to what to liken the position of my hon.

friend if it be not to that of the fabled god who created his children in order that he might destroy them. It would appear that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) floated this navy agitation on the country for no other purpose than to destroy it. But, there is another reason of course. Perhaps I am not giving my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) credit for enough astuteness, and perhaps it is that the hon. gentleman thought by propounding this policy, that possibly the leader of the government might not be disposed to enter upon the inauguration of a policy which it was Canada's duty to enter upon in her own interests as well as the interests of the empire, and perhaps my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) in his heart of hearts hoped that the Prime Minister of Canada would have refused to adopt that policy. And then how the old flag would be waved and how the eagles would scream, and how the woods would ring about this French Canadian leader of the Liberal party who declined to take part in the defence of Canada or the empire. But, my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) misjudged the Prime Minister. Would my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) like to hear some of the other things he said two years ago and all of which he has discarded in that rambling speech of his to-night, in which he said that although old Britain might be threatened on every sea and although her flag might be imperilled on every ocean, Canada should stand pat and do nothing. England with her internal problems of tariff reform and of land policy and of many other questions, was according to him to wait and wait until she reaches the time when possibly imperial federation or the admission of colonial into equal consideration with the empire in empire concerns might be obtained; my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) to-night says: I am prepared to sit down and wait for that indefinite period to arrive, and that, mind you after all these eloquent sayings of his just eighteen months ago. Let me read one or two of them for the purpose of comparison. Here are the words of my hon. friend, and they sound very queer to-night when he is going to vote that nothing shall be done :

"For five centuries the patient, toiling British taxpayer has paid the bill and paid it with a cheerful countenance, and so far without grumbling. Can you find in the history of the world any more sublime figure and instrumentality of great and powerful good worked in so unselfish a way and borne so cheerfully and unstintingly by the few millions of people that live in the islands in the North Sea. To some, and I confess to myself, it is true, for very shame's sake, that we did something and did something adequate. Oh, but says some objector, Great Britain is bound to protect the empire, her prestige demands it, her interests demand it. Well, all I have to say of that argument at the present time is that it is not the argument of the brave."

Yes, he is a brave man this afternoon in his effort to face the record of these words which will always remain here, indelibly marking the attitude of his leader and himself in regard to this matter, and branding them as performing the most wonderful political gymnastic trick that has been seen of late years :

"Or of the generous-hearted, or of the self-respecting, or of the properly independent man, and it is not the argument for a nation of young and growing people which is a candidate for nationhood."

Now, every word that my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) said there in answer to the argument, applies to the attitude which he will take when he votes to-night. Then, the hon. gentleman put himself on record positively as to his views. He did not want a contribution in 1909, he took four pages of 'Hansard' to argue against it. He told us it was not the attitude of a self-respecting nation or people to hire sombody else to do the work which they might do themselves, and he said :

"I put away the Monroe doctrine as absolutely unthinkable for us to grow up to national manhood under and so I come to the conclusion, imperfectly argued out I know, first: That protection is necessary, absolutely necessary; that we cannot as a people owe our protection to the United States of America or to any other foreign power; that that protection must be either borne by ourselves or by ourselves in conjunction with Great Britain and in co-operation with the Mother Country. I think these conclusions are logically deducible from the argument I have already used."

Let me say again, my hon. friend now asserts that everything shall be postponed until imperial confederation is attained.

But my hon. friend told us that he did not think it was a good idea to have these ships built in Canada or that we should have a Canadian navy. I read with a great deal of admiration the address of my hon. friend of 1909; but I was more disappointed than I can find words to say, to find that my hon. friend had deserted the position he had taken with such ability in 1909, and I was surprised to find,, in the bold assertion he made to the House that he had not gone back on a single word he had then uttered, that he did not realize the attitude in which his leader's resolution was placing him. But perhaps I am mistaken; I am sure I am, for I am sure no man in this House realizes better than my hon. friend from North Toronto, the ignominous position in which he is placed by the resolution of his leader. This is what my hon. friend said :

"We are absolutely bare of the skill, the experience, the training and the power ne-

cessary to put one single war vessel on a proper footing; but—and it is but the beginning of a circle—the first Canadian owned vessel, built and equipped in Britain, and sent out to defend our coasts would become the nucleus and the training ground of Canadian stokers, Canadian sailors, and Canadian officers, and by perhaps, of a Canadian admiral on the Canadian coast. How much time would be taken in completing that circle none of us can say, but if we begin the circumscription of it and follow it fairly and faithfully, the time must come when we get a complete circle and have an imperial adjunct to the British navy for the defence of Canada and the defence of the empire, in which Canada has some of her body, her bones, her blood, and her mental power."

My hon. friend knows that these words grate very harshly upon the ears of the hon. gentleman who sits behind him :

"First would come the dockyard, which would be of sufficient size to enable us to repair the smaller vessels and may be in time build the smaller class of vessels that we need at first, to be implemented by co-operation between Canada and Great Britain in the shape of a dock-yard sufficient to dock any lame vessel of the British navy that might happen to limp to our coast and require refitting and repairs. And so, in that progressive, gradual way coming up to the fulfilment of this idea, a defensive force in Canada which would be an auxiliary in the case of an outbreak of actual hostilities, which would be sufficient for the ordinary surveillance of our coasts and which would be, in time of war, sufficient to work in conjunction with the main portion of the fleet that would be sent to that part of our country that was menaced."

That is what was said by the hon. member for North Toronto, and in face of the fact that this government is carrying out that policy to the last iota in all respects I would ask my hon. friend to tell me what part of the plan laid down in these sentences this government is departing from. Have we not got the preliminary ships from England? Is not the 'Niobe' in Halifax, and the 'Rainbow' in Vancouver ? With Englishmen as officers, it is true, but with three times as many young men offering for examination as naval cadets as could be received in these vessels. Have we not made provision for a naval college to be maintained in Halifax, where instrutcion will go on this winter? Is provision not being made for the construction of dockyards, where the lame ducks of the British navy and these other vessels can dock? with all the preliminaries which my hon. friend outlined proceeding along these lines at the hands of this government, my hon. friend wants the country to stop the whole thing, to shut up the naval college, to tell these young Canadian who have gone up for examination as naval cadets, we do not want you at all, go back to your homes, to send the ships back to England, and then to wait for imperial federation to come.

My hon. friend was not satisfied with having a unanimous resolution passed. On the 12th of April, 1909, so keen and hot was he for action to be taken that he queried the government in this House as to what was going to be done to implement the resolution . He was told by the right hon. leader of the House that this government proposed to send to England the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Minister of Militia and Defence to treat with the home authorities with regard to the subject. My hon. friend appeared to be satisfied with that because he said nothing about it; and his attitude continued to be the same until last year, when, with the change of attitude on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, my hon. friend swung round on this question to a certain degree. He did not want a Canadian navy at all. He did not want Canada to go on and build dockyards, naval colleges and shipyards, as he said they should do in 1909. In a long harrangue in this House last winter, he attacked the right hon. leader of the government as a separationist, and, by distortions of various extracts which he read, he asked the House to believe that the government were lacking in their duty and were disloyal to the empire because they had not gone on and made arrangements under which everything we had in Canada would be placed at the disposal of the British Empire. He talked vigorously about the windmills of autonomy against which the right hon. leader of the House was tilting—the rag baby of autonomy, he called it. I do not know wnether my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier was in the House when my hon. friend made the speech of last year or not. He certainly was not in the House to-day, when my hon. friend from North Toronto declared vigorously that the cry of autonomy was being overworked. Now, if there is anybody in this country who is overworking the cry of autonomy, it is the hon. member for Jacques Cartier who sits immediately behind him. What did my hon. friend say about that ? He said this :

"It is a rag baby. Autonomy was born and grew to manhood and has been a man in this country for forty or fifty years. This is but a make-believe—a rag baby"

Yet it was this rag baby of autonomy that was overworked in Drummond and Arthabaska, which according to my hon. friend misled the electors and won the election. Then he proceeded to blame the government because we had not done as he said Australia had done, and provided for the construction of a unit. My hon. friend has attempted to lead the House to believe that Australia has done some-

thing that we have not done. My hon. friend asserted this afternoon that had Canada done what Australia had done, this resolution would have never been before the House. My hon. friend must know that we have done exactly what Australia has done—that our autonomy has been maintained under this government's policy just as Australia maintains its autonomy, that the Defence Act of Australia expressly provides that the ships belonging to Australia shall not leave the home station either in peace or war without the consent of the Governor in Council. If my hon. friend did not know that, now that he has learned the fact, I presume he will support the government, because he told us this afternoon that had we done what Australia was doing, he would not be found opposing the resolution.

Mr. FOSTER. Do not asume too much.

Mr. MACDONALD. I could not expect my hon. friend, knowing him as I do, to come right over to us, but we all know that he is in a very uncomfortable position. He told us clearly this afternoon what his feelings are regarding the confusions that exist and further that he does not know where to turn to escape the embarassing and disastrous conditions which exist around him.

In his well known speech of 1909 my hon. friend, who is given to being classical, used these words which, so far as one can judge the meaning of the English language, must rather shock the ears of those who listened to his speech this afternoon. Let me quote what the hon. gentleman said :

"The old mother speaking to her assembled sons, those whom she had borne in pain and nutured with care, and welcomed to the old home again, and told them in no beggar's tones just the difficulties of the old homestead, and the troubles, and trials and burdens. There was the mute appeal of the weary Titan whose very muscle was corded, and whose every bone was set to the strain, under the mighty and constantly increasing burden of the defence of the empire. That mute appeal, looking into the faces of the sons returned."

Just fancy the old mother making a mute appeal, such as my hon. friend has described, looking into the faces of hon. gentlemen opposite to-day, and just fancy the answer they are giving to that appeal.

"There were forty millions of British taxpayers responding to the appeal of the old mother, to the mute appeal of the weary Titan, paying their hard earned taxes year after year in increasing quantity to keep the homestead intact, and to keep the empire free from the marauder."

That mute appeal gets a very unsympathetic answer from hon. gentlemen opposite. They tell the old Titanic mother, that, so far as they are concerned, she may be destroyed, and they will not turn a hand to help her. And my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), who spoke these words I have just quoted, is now prepared to vote that nothing shall be done. Let me again quote my hon. friend. He closed with these words :

"I ask him if, after he has put this policy of his into execution, and the quick years pass by and nothing comes of benefit or help, and if some day Armageddon breaks out on the North Sea or elsewhere."

What if Armageddon should break out, and the policy of these hon. gentlemen were adopted. While they were sitting down waiting for imperial federation, Armageddon might arrive and there would be no more British Empire.

"And the fate of the empire and of Canada hangs in the balance, and if—which God forbid— the scales should lower on Britain's side and the conqueror should take her place on the sea, where will my right hon. friend go for consolation in that time? I would not like to be in his place."

There are a good many who would not like to-day to be in the place of the hon. member for North Toronto.

Mr. FOSTER. I know that quite well. They would sooner be on that side.

Mr. MACDONALD (reading):

"I tell you that besides simply doing your duty, you take the most effective means of meeting the emergency, for it is an emergency by tsrengthening the fleet of the British Empire. Here is Canada with her $100,000,000 of revenue, Canada with all that she has and that has been given her and kept for her by the hard working taxpayers of the British Isles, now is it that we can for a moment refuse to play the manly part, the Canadian part and the imperial part, and go to the defence of the empire and ourselves.?"

If the hon. gentleman were responsive to any appeal that might be made to him and were I gifted with his eloquence, I would like to transpose that appeal and ask him whether he is going to wait patiently for imperial federation or give an active and effective response to his own language of two years ago. But my hon. friend occupies a difficult position which the House well understands, and the circuitous methods he adopted this afternoon in his endeavours to square himself with the resolution of his leader were interesting and instructive. I am bound to say that few hon. gentlemen could have done the thing so dexterously, and even though he did not show that facility he usually displays, and even though he did not accomplish the feat, still he made a very game attempt at it.

However, he told us boldly that we were estopped from saying that Canada should not contribute because of some phrase in the resolution which he interpreted with a good deal of casuistry to imply that this House stood for contribution. Yet, on the former occasion to which I have alluded, he spoke to the extent of over four pages of 'Hansard' to argue that contributions were a bad policy.

This afternoon he told us that he was opposed to the proposition of the government because the ships are to be built in Canada. I do not know what the junior member for Halifax would say to that. He and the chief organ of the opposition in that city have been busy bewailing that fact that Halifax has been overlooked and in urging that Halifax is the one place in the whole empire where the ships ought to be built. No doubt my hon. friend from St. John has an equally praiseworthy ambition; and I do not envy my hon. friend when he goes back to St. John and tell the people there that, as far as his vote could do it, he effectively took from them any possibility of building these ships until imperial federation is accomplished.

Mr. DANIEL. No doubt the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) will vote that they should all be built in Courtenay bay.

Mr. MACDONALD. But unfortunately he will not be able to count on the assistance of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I hope they will be built before imperial federation comes.

Mr. MACDONALD. I do not know whether my hon. friend from North Toronto has very much taste for fruit or vegetables of a certain kind, but I do think that the expression he used in describing the resolution of his leader (Mr. Borden) when he called it a dish of cucumbers, was certainly a very unique one. There are many hon. gentlemen so constituted that this vegetable does not agree with them, and I am afraid that my hon. friend from North Toronto is one of these. Judging by his remark, he evidently experienced considerable nausea in swallowing this resolution of his leader, and found it a very unpalatable dish.

My hon. friend was very much annoyed over some article that appeared in the year 1900 in some newspaper, and what appeared particularly to annoy him was that it referred to the leaders of the Conservative party as being big and fat. Can it be that he was consumed with jealousy because he could not come within that category.

He said that we had no right to assume that England had withdrawn her ships from Canada. But my hon. friend knows that England handed over to Canada the yards at Halifax and Esquimalt, and that these yards have since been maintained by us. My hon. friend was quibbling. He was attempting to make some point against the right hon. the Prime Minister, and wanted to indicate that the Prime Minister was misleading the province of Quebec when he made the statement that England had withdrawn her ships from this country. But my right hon. friend simply told the people of Quebec that for the last five or six years there had been no English ships at our stations in Halifax and Esquimalt, and that the control of the yards had been assumed by the Canadian government. Which would you rather have, my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) asked, the British fleet or the 'Rainbow ?' Well, is there anything the matter with the 'Rainbow ?' Will any hon. gentleman say on his responsibility as a member of this House that the 'Rainbow' is not thoroughly first-class in every respect? That, for her size, she is not in every way suitable for full service ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MACDONALD. Hon. gentlemen may laugh, but those who do have never seen any ships, and it is to those who never saw ships and to men who never saw them and who know nothing about them that the hon. gentleman must appeal.

Hon. members opposite think they have a great asset in this resolution, because they hope to go into the country districts far from the sea and mislead the people with their fairy tales about a 'tin-pot' navy. But I venture to say that my hon. friend from North Toronto will not state in his place in paraliament that the 'Rainbow' is not a thoroughly good vessel in every way and up to date, for he knows she comes to us from England with a certificate from the imperial authorities as to her capacity that is beyond all question. It is very well for the hon. gentleman, in his speech this afternoon, to give us warnings about China, and Russia, and Japan and the United States. But I venture to say that if he had done as he would like to do he would have expressed his views in a separate resolution. He may declare this menace is at our doors, that at any moment China, Russia, Japan, or even the United States may menace our Pacific coast; and then he may turn round and vote, following his leader, that that condition may exist, yet that nothing should be done until imperial federation comes to pass. Were it not for the fear the hon. member has of the hon. member of Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) he would have moved a resolution of his own. He knows, when he puts the question: 'Which will you have, the Rainbow or the British fleet ?' that he is begging the question. He knows that to-day, as at all times in the past, the fleet of Britain is ready to protect the shores of Canada. He knows, too, that the policy of the Canadian government to-day, the policy which he himself outlined two years ago, was to have here on the Atlantic and on the Pacific

auxiliary fleets which would work with the fleet of Great Britain in times of danger.

Mr. HUGHES. Is that what you said in Drummond and Arthabaska ?

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes) is not too enthusiastic about this proposition that nothing should be done until imperial federation comes. Perhaps we might as well get along without having any special differences with him, understanding, as we do quite well, his position in regard to this matter.

The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), when listening this afternoon to his lieutenant—the lieutenant whom he did not take with him on his tour last summer —must have wondered where the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was going to land—unless the whole thing was discussed beforehand, and there are very strong evidences that it was. But if my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) was waiting for the hon. member for North Toronto to declare his position he must have gone through a bad two hours and a half—for it took my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) two hours and a half to thread his way through the maze of contradictions which it was necessary for him to pass in order to land at the point where he could support the resolution of his leader in spite of his own utterances of two years ago. Of course, the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) was in an even worse position than his lieutenant. He declared against contributions two years ago and in favour of a Canadian navy to be built in Canada, and insisted upon the right hon. leader of this House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) amending his resolution so as to provide for the construction of the navy immediately. He went to England and there reiterated the policy which he had declared to this House. He came to his own constituency in the city of Halifax and declared that on this question there should be no division, that a compact had been formed, and that on that compact he was going to stand, and that there was no reason why the people of Halifax and of the maritime provinces generally should not look forward at an early day, as a result of that policy, to the construction of ships to be begun once more along our coasts. He has had to make a marvellous lot of the same kind of gyrations as his lieutenant in order to be able to land behind the Nationalist policy, as he did two years ago. The hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) was supported in the position he took by the former leader of his party. He had not the good or bad fortune, as the case may be, in his early days to be a follower of Sir Charles Tupper; before he went astray, he was opposed to Sir Charles. Yet, Sir Charles Tupper felt that he had a right to admonish this gentleman when he had assumed the position of leader and had formed a compact on which men of all nationalities in this country had agreed to stand as to our future policy in the naval service. Sir Charles Tupper was here when this confederation was born; he was present when Sir John Macdonald moved the resolution by which this parliament was empowered to provide for the naval service. He always held strong views on Canada's attitude on the question, and maintained that attitude as long as he was in public life. He wrote my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) this letter :

"I am glad to learn that you have resolved to maintain the patriotic attitude that the Conservative party assumed last session.

"A few years ago, when Canada was struggling to open up for British settlement the great granary of the world, some people raised the question of a Canadian contribution to the imperial navy. I joined issue with them and was sustained by the press and public opinion.

"The demand will soon be made by some that Canada should contribute to the imperial navy in proportion to population, I regard as preposterous and dangerous. I read with pleasure the resolution passed unanimously by the House of Commons which pledged parliament to proceed vigorously with the construction of the Canadian navy and to support England in every emergency. . . . I cannot understand the demand for Dreadnoughts in the face of the fact that the Admiralty and the British government have determined that it was not the best mode of maintaining the security of the empire, and arranged with Canada and Australia (the latter of whom had offered one or two Dreadnoughts) for the construction of local navies to keep open the trade routes in case of war."

It may be that hon. gentlemen who sit behind the leader of the opposition and who have spoken in this debate, know more about the views of the English Admiralty than does Sir Charles Tupper; it may be that these gentlemen are so officially versed in naval warfare that they are able to dispute the opinion of the English Admiralty as given here authoritatively by the former leader of the Conservative party; it may be, but I doubt it. Then the leader of the opposition had this additional admonition :

"I cannot avoid thinking, says Sir Charles Tupper, that a fearful responsibility will rest upon those who disturb or destroy the compact entered into on this vitally important question."

And yet the leader of the opposition immediately proceeds to break the compact. True, he kept the faith in January of last year, he kept it until the second reading of the Naval Bill, and then the anti-imperialist gentlemen from Quebec got in

their work, and this compromise resolution, which broke the compact, which threw this apple of discord among various sections of the people of this country is introduced, and for the consequences, my hon. friend is responsible, and he alone is responsible. By departing from the compact of 1909, in order if possible to line up behind him his friends from Quebec, he acted contrary to the mature judgment of those who concluded that Canada was doing the right thing, because, in putting in this clause about the contribution, he flouted the views and judgment of his predecessor, the man who had been in public life for over forty years, the man who had been engaged in the settlement of confederation, and of all the great projects which had been associated with his name. My hon. friend broke the compact, and he must take the responsibility. If appeals are made to anti-imperialists in the county of Drummond-Arthabaska, if the fires of discord and disunion are lighted in this country, my hon. friend himself must take the responsibility for it. He is neglecting the warning which his predecessor gave him when he said that a fearful responsibility would rest upon the man who broke the compact. As my hon. friend from North Toronto had said, I heard him use the expression once, the leader of the opposition got on a toboggan slide, and the descent was very easy from standing for a contribution last year, and in a half-hearted way for a reference to the people, and he has now burst up the compact altogether this year, and where has he landed? He has landed in a position where he declares nothing whatever shall be done, but he says if a crisis should arise then we will think about it. My hon. friend says further that as to a settled policy it will be time enough to consider it when we get imperial federation. Last year my hon. friend and some of those who sit behind him were shocked with the position of the member for Jacques Cartier. The member for North Toronto, in the absence of the member for Jacques Cartier last year, inveighed against those people who were talking about the rag baby of autonomy,, and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier used these words :

"Are we going to be in the position that the whole foreign policy of the empire is going to be framed and formed and carried out by a cabinet of men in Downing street absolutely controlled and elected by the electorate of the British Isles, that we, British subjects like themselves, are going to be placed upon a different footing, that we are to be responsible for everything while having no voice in the conducth of anything ?"

Now that language sounded very harsh last year, it grated upon the ears of a good many hon. gentlemen. I doubt not that the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) was much disturbed by language of that kind. In his speech this year he certainly gave no adhesion to any such utterances as the member for Jacques Carteir made last year. But how easy was the descent of my hon. friend the leader of the Conservative party from the high pinnacle of two years ago, so easy and so sudden that on the 24th of November last, this is while having no voice in the conduct of the Conservative party :

"If Canada and the other dominions of the empire are to take their part as nations of this empire in the defence of the empire as a whole, shall it be that we, contributing to that defence of the whole empire, shall have absolutely, as citizens of this country, no voice whatever in the councils of the empire relating to the choice of peace or war throughout the empire? I od not think that would be a tolerable condition, I do not think the people of Canada would for one moment submit to such a condition. Should members of this House, representative men, representing 220 constituencies of this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific, no one of them have the same voice with regard to those enormous imperial issues that the humblest taxpayer in the British Isles has at this moment ?

That sounds strange coming from the leader of the Liberal Conservative party, as they delight to call themselves; it is in very strange contrast to the policy of the hon. member for North Toronto this afternoon. When the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Crothers) the other day wound up an eloquent peroration by quoting from Tennyson about one flag, one fleet, one King, one Throne, these words are strangely lacking in apositiveness with the proposition of the leader of the Couservative party, that not a dollar will be given for an imperial navy, or any navy, until a citizen of Canada has as much right as a citizen of Great Britain to say what is going to be done with it first. Yet that is the position of the Conservative party to-day. My hon. friend asked the House to express regret that there is no indication whatever in the speech of His Excellency of an intention to consult the people on the naval policy of Canada, a resolution which, let me say, my hon. friend would never have moved had it not been that the member for Jacques Cartier had moved one previously. The leader of the opposition seemed to be somewhat annoyed at the fact that, in the province of Quebec, he was spoken of as the vicar of Laurier, but seems to be quite ready to accept the position in which he will be known hereafter as the vicar of Bourassa. What is my hon. friend going to say to the constituents in the city of Halifax, after what he told them two years ago? He said that he had made a compact that would lift above the realm of party politics the whole naval question, and that his constituents could hope for a time when the ships would

be constructed there. What is he going to say to them to-day? What is hegoing to say about Mr. McBride, the premier of British Columbia, who does not hold these views as to a Canadian navy which are now advocated by the leader of the opposition, but who stands by what his leader said a year ago, not by what his leader says to-day; who stands by what the member for North Toronto said two years ago, and not by what he says to-day; who does not stand with the anti-imperialists like the member for Jacques Cartier? This is the language that the premier of British Columbia put upon a piece of silver plate which the people of that province, out of their public treasury, presented to the 'Rainbow,' the first ship of the Canadian navy to reach their shores :

"Presented by the people of British Columbia to His Majesty's Canadian steamship 'Rainbow,' in welcome recognition of this being the first ship of the Canadian navy on the Pacific, and the loyal belief that the 'Rainbow' will successfully fulfil her part in strengthening the naval defence of the empire."

That was the language of the government of the Hon. Richard McBride, Conservative premier of British Columbia. That is not what the leader of the opposition said, that is not what the member for North Toronto said, that is not following the policy of the member for Jacques Cartier. Then the strange thing is that all the while these gentemen are professing great devotion to the mother country, telling us what should be done for her, and who pretend that this navy does not adequately represent our position in the empire, does not give to the empire the service which we should give. Sir, my hon. friends will search in vain the files of the English newspapers, or other documents, for utterances of English public men during the last year to find from either Liberal or Conservative a single statement of disapproval of the attitude of this government in regard to the naval policy. It may be that these gentlemen know better than the statesmen of the old land what is best for the relations between Canada and the empire. It may be that these Solons who change their opinions every six months on this question, who break compacts which their venerable leaders declare are in the best interests of the country, it may be that these men are better judges than the statesmen of England, but I think the people of this country, when they see through their little tinsel game, will realize how utterly inadequate they are to frame policies or to take positions which make for the permanence of Canada or of the empire. What was the statement made in regard to the position of this country and the empire three weeks ago, by the Hon. Alfred Lyttelton, Secretary for the Colonies, in the late Conservative government? Speaking at Birmingham University upon the position and condition of the chief British Dominions and their relation to the mother country, Mr. Lyttelton said :

"The sense of nationality in the dominions had urged upon them the paramount duty of providing their defence against foreign attack, and it was no exaggeration to say that a scheme had now been launched for an imperial navy capable of indefinite expansion, subject always to the right of each to approve or disapprove entering or not entering upon war."

And that was received with applause by the cultured audience who were present at that university.

Mr. SMITH. (Nanaimo). In Birmingham?

Mr. MACDONALD. In Birmingham, the home of Joseph Chamberlain, the head of the movement of tariff reform, and surely Mr. Lyttelton knows as much about the utility of a scheme of this kind as does the leader of the opposition or his lieutenants. The inevitable results of the attitude adopted by my hon. friends has been shown by the appeals to sectionalism and the appeals against English interests in this country that were made in Drummond and Arthabaska. The understanding, if not the formal alliance, between the leader of the opposition and his chief lieutenant from Quebec, the leader in this House at least, if not outside, of the anti-imperialists, is one which has produced the decadence in the Conservative party that is discernible in the House; but in addition to that it is once more raising the flames of sectionalism in this country. This is not the first time, however, that my hon. friends have indulged in these tactics. The first appearance of Nationalism occurred in 1900 when the leader of this House and this government for the first time in all our history gave aid to the mother country by sending a contingent to South Africa. Some hon. gentleman on a back seat said the other day that the government were forced to send them. That is not what the anti-imperialist allies of the leader of the opposition said in the province of Quebec. We heard something this afternoon about a pamphlet, some very special pleading by which the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) tried to show that somebody connected with the Liberal party had done something in the way of appealing to sectionalism. Every one recollects, it was only a few hours ago when my hon. friend's tactics were exposed, and when he was attempting to read in French a pamphlet which contained the incendiary and sectional articles written by the Conservative press in Ontario. My hon. friends will remember that in 1900 the famous pamphlet No. 6 was circulated by the Conservative party in the province of Quebec. That was the year in which the issue was as to the

participation of Canada in the war in South Africa. I have here a pamphlet issued at that time. Here are the headlines :

"Imperial federation. Laurier approves of it; Tupper condemns it.

"The South African war. Sir Wilfrid Laurier declares that we will take part in other British wars if needed.

"The Manitoba school question. The Conservative leaders and the French Canadians, Sir Charles Tupper and the Hon. Mr. Foster."

The same gentleman who sits here now, who read this pamphlet this afternoon. These gentlemen are no tyros at this game of sectionalism, they are old hands at it, and because they are their alliance and their common interest is more easily detected perhaps than it was before. Talking about appeals to sectionalism, talking about appeals to certain people in Quebec in regard to England, let us see what these gentlemen put forth in 1900. Speaking of the imperial federation scheme, for which my hon. friend the leader of the opposition is waiting, this publication says :

Imperialism.

"The first utterance of imperialism were made in London by Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Then it was that he put the Canadian soldiers at the service of the English.

"Canada to do honour to the Prime Minister had sent to England the very cream of the troops to act as a bodyguard. A splendid detachment of mounted police, a battalion composed of the elite of our militia were sent to London and aroused the enthusiasm of the old metropolis. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, dazzled by the applause of which he was the object, then committed the fatal mistake to give vent to words which were binding us to the war destinies of Great Britain.

"Then and there was sealed the pact now stained with Canadian blood which flowed at Paardeberg, Belmont, Mafeking, Faber Farm and in many other encounters.

On the 18th of June, 1897, at a banquet held at the imperial institute, after a military review before Lord Lansdowne, Secretary of War, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, in a moment of enthusiasm, put all the Canadian troops at the disposal of the empire.

As a worthy descendant of French blood, he chose the anniversary of Waterloo to make the offer. According to a cablegram dated London, June 18 1897, to the 'Globe,' on Lord Lansdowne, asking if, in case of just conflicts, the colonies would be willing to help England, and Sir Wilfrid is said to have replied as follows :

Lord Lansdowne has mentioned that a day may come when the empire might be threatened. This date, anniversary of the battle of Waterloo."

Here was the appeal for condemnation by his own compatriots in the province of Quebec because he spoke on that date, "reminds us that at all times England has proved itself able to win its own wars, but should a day come when it should be in danger, then let the bugle blow and rallying fires be lighted on the hills and in the colonies, and though we may not be able to do very much, we shall give all the help within our means."

With that preamble there is a long story in a style somewhat similar to what was employed in Drummond and Arthabaska, appeals to the people of Quebec to condemn Laurier because he stood for imperial federation, because he had sent the sons of Canada to South Africa and because he had sold out the rights of his co-religionists and his race in that province on the Manitoba school question. These gentlemen are no tyros at this game. What took place then in 1904 ? My hon. friends were playing the game the other way. They attempted an appeal to the sons of old Caledonia, of the race from which my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. Tolmie) and myself have sprung; we were told that because Lord Dundonald had not been treated properly every Scotchman in Canada who had a drop of blood in his veins would rise in protest. Mr. Speaker, the sons of the men who come from old Scotland, have for many centuries been close allies and friends with the men who come from sunny France. Their history and ours runs side by side, and it might be well to recall the significant fact which perhaps is sometimes forgotten, that in Scotland to-day they have retained a memorial of our relationship with the French in the laws of Scotland which are based upon the code laws of France and the Roman law.

And just as the Scotchmen in Canada spurned the appeal which was made to their race in 1904, and just as the French Canadians in 1900 spurned the appeal that was made to them, so this isolated little bit of pleasure that these gentlemen on the oher side of he House now have, will be found to be but the presage of a great gloom which will come on them when the issue is truly realized by the people of Canada. In 1904, what had the Liberal party to contend with in this country ? My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) pretended to be shocked over the fact that appeals were made in Protestant constituencies in Canada to vote against the Liberal party because their leader was a French Canadian and a Roman Catholic. There is not a Liberal member in this House who lives in a Protestant constitu-

ency who does not know that to be true. In four federal elections in which I have taken part that insidious canvass was made by organized Conservative representatives in that Protestant constiuency which I have the honour to represent. Last election 'The Duty of the Hour was circulated wherever it was thought it would alienate a Liberal from his party or influence a man in a Protestant constituency.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe.) Circulated by the Liberal party.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) has all he can do to square himself on this question of the navy without making any further interruptions. He said it was circulated by the Liberal party; let me tell him I have in my possession copies of 'The Duty of the Hour' that was circulated in my county and which came from the Conservative organization. At the same time in the province of Quebec appeals were being made in all quarters by the anti-imperialists and by the Conservatives to vote against Sir Wilfrid Laurier because on the Northwest Autonomy Bills he had sold away the rights of his co-religionists and felloy countrymen of Quebec.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what do these two amendments which we have before the House mean in clear cold English as a contribution to the settlement of this naval policy. I say they have no significance whatever; they are not put forward seriously. The two hon. gentlemen who proposed these amendments forget that this whole question was settled by this House of Commons fresh from the people. In that compact made in 1909, to which every gentleman in this House of every shade of politics gave assent, there was marked a great step forward in the line of Canadian unity, and in the settlement of a question which was of vast import to Canada and the empire. And, Sir, the sole issue before this House and before the people of Canada to-day is: shall that compact be observed? The Liberal government of Canada has gone on and respected that compact. By arrangement with the admiralty they have carried out a scheme which protects Canadian interests, preserves our autonomy, and in all respects fulfils our duty to the empire. The question now is whether or not we shall be manful and square about that. Shall we swallow our words of two years ago; shall all the words of patriotism which these gentlemen opposite gave to the House be wipe dout, or, shall we stand true and loyal to the policy that was then decided on, a policy that received the approval of England; a policy that has no opposition to-day except fom the anti-imperialists in this country. The issue here is whether or not the Canadian people are to remain united. The leader of the opposition, deceived by the glamour of a little bickering due to local complications in a county in Quebec thinks perchance that by throwing himself into the hands of the re-actionaries of that province he possibly can win success. But in 1900, when the appeal was made in regard to the South African war, Mr. Bourassa was as eloquent then as he is to-day and although he had carried Labelle in a bye-election the people of Canada when they understood the question voted on behalf of Canadian unity and the Liberal party. So in 1904, although Robitaille carried Quebec county as a Nationalist, and although gentlemen opposite thought that one swallow made a summer just as they do to-day, this swallow will turn out to be all alone and the people of all Canada, understanding the solemn compact made between all classes of the people in this country in 1909, will stand by it and support this government. And, we of the Liberal party stand prepared to respect that compact made in 1909. We stand against sectionalism, we stand against this anti-imperialism which is but a cloak for anti-Canadianism. Racial appeals may be made and no doubt they will be made, but Sir, they will fail. In 1900, the right hon. the Prime Minister, under circumstances almost similar to those which exist to-day, spoke in this House of Commons on March 13th with regard to the issue raised on the South African war, and these are his noble words:—

"If there is anything to which I have devoted my political life it is to try to promote unity, harmony and amity between the diverse elemnts of this country. My friends can desert me, they can remove their confidence from me, they can withdraw the trust they have placed in my hands, but never shall I deviate from that line of policy.

Whatever may be the consequences, whether loss of prestige, loss of popularity or loss of power. I feel that I am in the right and I know that a time will come when every man will render me full justice on that score."

And for the last ten years, in the light of that declaration the Canadian people have followed him. Men of all classes have realized that unless we have amity and unity and concert of action amongst Canadians of all races, Canada will never reach her high destiny, and knowing that the Liberal party stands for that amity and unity, they have returned to power Sir Wilfrid Laurier its great leader. Just as in 1900 with these ringing words of the Prime Minister going to the people, Canada stood by this government, so when the next appeal is made, Canadians will rally around the party which stands for everything that is highest in our national life.